HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WESTERN TOUR

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE
WESTERN TOUR

Prepared by the
Ontario Task Force on
Roomers, Boarders and Lodgers

September 9th, 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The day was spent with Scott Kutner, Assistant to the Director of the SRO Housing Corporation and Sylvia Ruiz, Director of Program Management. The Director, Andy Raubeson, was away at a Conference, but has agreed to provide a paper for the Task Force on the experiences of Los Angeles, as well as other cities, such as Portland, where he was involved for many years before coming to Los Angeles.

History of the Corporation

The Single Room Occupancy Corporation is a non-profit organization, established on February 14, 1984 to acquire, renovate, and manage residential hotels as affordable housing. The motivation behind the creation of this group was the loss of 5,000 - 6,000 units of low cost housing in the Bunker Hill area of Los Angeles. The City had tried to make direct loans to various owners at 3% interest rates, but only 4 hotels took advantage of the program since 1981. The decision to establish the Corporation was made in 1983, after several years of study by the Community Redevelopment Agency of L.A. A series of "intervention areas" were defined with the priority area being centered on East Fifth Street and San Julian, near City Hall.

The Corporation became operational in early 1984 with an Executive Director, a secretary, and a Project Planner hired later in the year. The Commuity Development Agency originally committed a budget of $9.75 million in 1984, which was increased to $15 million the following year. A Low Income Housing Trust Fund was set up whereby loans at 3% simple interest for 30 years could be made. There was no repayment required for five years.

In the first year of operation, the Corporation completed a demographic and social characteristics survey of residents of S.R.O. hotels. 30 hotels and 174 residents were interviewed. Currently, the Corporation is interviewing 72 hotel managers to obtain more information on hotels and their facilities. (A final Report in due in July, 1986).

Program Activity to Date

Since creation of the Corporation, 7 hotels with 786 units have been acquired. When each hotel is renovated, base rents will range from $143 to $185 per month. Each building will be brought into full compliance with the Los Angeles Earthquake Safety and Fire Safety ordinances and tenant amentities will be improved significantly.

At present, both the Panama and Russ hotels are operated almost exclusively for homeless indigents receiving housing vouchers under the L.A. County General Relief Program. One of the hotels, the Leo, will be operated as an alcohol free living community for recovering alcoholics and will be staffed with a live-in recovery counsellor.

As an example of renovation costs, the Florence Hotel, which consisted of 60 units of approximately 150 square feet each, cost approximately $12,000-$15,000 per unit to renovate, and about $5,000 per unit to acquire, for an average of $17,000 - $20,000 per unit. This includes carpeting, refrigerators, drapes, etc.

In response to requests for technical assistance from non-profit groups and other residential hotel operators, SRO Housing continues to provide technical assistance on matters ranging from planning and design criteria to financial budgeting and management plans. Also, in April 1985, SRO Housing sponsored a National Conference on SRO Hotels. The conference was attended by 102 people from all over the United States. Conference attendees toured the L.A. area, attended a series of workshops on design, finance, management and maintenance of SRO hotels. Featured speakers were Mayor Tom Bradley and Barry Zigas, Executive Director of the National Low-Income Housing Coalition. SRO Housing also jointly published the S.R.O. Development Notebook which was distributed at the Conference.

In addition to the above, SRO Housing participated as a major co-sponsor of the 1986 Statewide Low-Income Housing Conference. This conference sponsored by the Progressive Housing Alliance was held in February, 1986 at the University of Southern California and was attended by approximately 300 people. Also, SRO Housing sponsors quarterly clean-up campaigns for Central City East, which results in cleaning up the streets and vacant lots in SRO Housing's priority intervention areas, as well as getting local residents involved in improving their own neighbourhoods.

SRO Housing also manages a Moving Assistance Program so as to not displace any permanent residents of the area. For example, permanent residents in the Florence Hotel were given assistance in locating suitable housing, moving and storing furniture and personal belongings, and a rent differential was paid to cover the cost of increased rent. All residents have re-entry rights when renovations are completed.

In order to keep hotels, once renovated, in decent, safe, and sanitary condition, a Maintenance Project was instituted in the first year. A supervisor was hired, who then hired a crew of seven maintenance workers, six of whom were formerly

homeless persons. The crew took on responsibility for site preparation of buildings to be renovated, as well as day to day maintenance tasks at other hotels, such as plumbing and electrical repairs, drywall and painting, floor repair and replacement, rehanging of doors, glazing, and related maintenance duties. SRO now has established several maintenance contracts with other hotels in the skid row area.

Special Resources Available From Los Angeles

A number of valuable documents were obtained from the SRO Housing Corporation that would be valuable for anyone wishing further practical guidance in the area of renovating and acquiring hotels in downtown central city areas. These include The S.R.O. Development Notebook and the S.R.O. Housing Management Handbook. The latter is a very large binder, the former is in booklet form and both can be obtained from Andy Raubeson, Executive Director, Single Room Occupancy Housing Corporation, 311 South Spring Street, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, California 90013 (telephone 213-488-9695).

Other valuable information uncovered in the visit was finding out about a major study underway on the financial return of SRO buildings for the Community Redevelopment Agency, by an L.A. firm called HRA (Hamilton Rabinovitz & Alschuler - 213-387-2333) which is quite similar to the landlord survey underway in Ontario for the Task Force. Also, of a number of local area studies collected, one of the best was entitled A Study of Homelessnes and Mental Illness in the Skid Row Area of Los Angeles, by Rodger K. Farr and Paul Koegel, Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health, March 1986. The Study can be obtained by writing the above department at 2415 W. 6th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90057 or calling 213-738-4832 and asking for Roberto Quiroz, Director.

Concluding Observations from Los Angeles

Experience in Los Angeles through the creation of a special SRO housing corporation for singles housing has shown that SRO housing can be renovated cost-effectively and that it can be managed in such a way that it is compatible with commercial revitalization in the same area. There have been attempts to bulldoze inner city areas of Skid Row only to see them spring up in other run-down areas of the same city. The S.R.O. Housing Corporation feels the situation in Los Angeles represents an approach to the problem that recognizes that central cities will continue to be a magnet for people with special needs, and that upgrading of housing, improvement of public amenities, and a co-ordinated approach to service delivery will provide a workable and humane solution.

VISIT TO SAN FRANCISCO June 12, 1986

9:30 a.m. Chinatown Resource Center/Housing Corp.
Gordon Chin, Executive Director

11:45 a.m. Bureau of Building Inspection (BBI)
Department of Apartment & Hotel Inspection
Peter Burns, Director of San Francisco Hotel Conversion and Demolition Ordinance

2:00 p.m. Mission Housing Development Corporation
Perry Winston, Rehab Officer
Paul Sussman, Finance Officer
Clio Tarazi, Property Manager

4:30 p.m. North of Market Planning Coalition
Brad Paul, Director
(Please refer to Special Commisioned Paper)

Chinese Community Housing Corporation

Background

The Executive Director of the Chinatown Neighbourhood Improvement Resource Center, which was set up in 1977, Mr. Gordon Chin, was interviewed at length, since this organization was instrumental in developing innovative housing solutions for San Francisco's Chinatown community through the establishment of the Chinese Community Housing Corporation in 1978. The development of this group dates back to 1970, when the City received a HUD grant to carry out a major housing and recreation study. The Study focused on the need for new public housing, and estimated a need for 2200 new units and 1900 rehab units for Chinatown. In the 1950's and 1960's Chinatown residents were not involved in the development of housing projects.

In the early 1970's, development of public housing projects went very slowly in Chinatown. For example, the 185 unit highrise, Meilun Yuen (140 seniors, 45 families) took 8 years to complete. There were, however, a few innovative projects during this period, such as the 54 unit On Lok project designed for the frail elderly, which combined HUD and Health, Education and Welfare funds; and a hotel conversion that converted 120 rooms to 84 self-contained apartments for seniors. In the 1974-75 period, a number of trends began to occur in San Francisco. There was a burgeoning of downtown development, high rise development

and displacement, and a great deal of foreign money came into the city to buy up property in the City's core. As a result, people began to pay a great deal of money for hotels. The other trends were a city-wide movement to preserve existing housing, and a general city-wide opposition to code enforcement, leading to gentrification and rent increases.

As a result of this pressure, the Chinatown Neighbourhood Improvement Resource Center was set up in 1977 with a planner and a community organizer. Its original mandate was comprehensive planning, technical assistance, public housing assistance, tenant lobbying, and updating of housing studies. Tenant protection was also an issue, since short-term residents of less than 28 days had no protection regarding evictions under California state law. Shortly after, in 1978, the Chinese Community Housing Corporation was set up, with funding from a combination of City Community Development Block Grants, project income, and foundation grants.

Major Objectives and Activities

The major objectives of CCHC are to increase the supply of affordable housing for low income residents, improve the quality of the existing housing stock, provide management services which are sensitive to the needs of both tenants and owners, and develop new models for the financing, rehabilitation and management of low income housing. CCHC offers low interest loans to private owners for the correction of housing code violations. In exchange, owners agree to maintain their units as low income housing. To date, the Chinese Community Housing Corporation has financed the rehabilitation of more than 220 units in at least four large hotels.

A typical project was the Clayton, which was acquired in June 1981 by the CCHC. The building, located in a Philipino neighbourhood of the city, served a low income residential population threatened by conversion to offices. The basement was rehabilited to provide space for the Manilatown Senior Center and the City provided funds to provide a roof garden. Acquisition was made possible with a combination of seller financing and equity capital from the City of San Francisco's Community Development Block Grant Site Acquisition Program through the Mayor's Office of Housing and Economic Development.

Rehabilitation included correcting all code violations, remodeling individual units with new lavatories, flooring and paint, upgrading the communal bathrooms, and adding a community kitchen and social room on each floor. The on-site management staff is composed of tenants trained by CCHC

to provide particular management, maintenance and social services to the residents.

In another project, the Grant, the management of housing units under a master lease contract with private owners is an alternative to actual site acquisition. Many multi-family buildings, including residential hotels, operate on a master lease system where the property owner leases the entire building to a management entity. The master lease holder in turn sublets the individual units to tenants. Master leasing by a non-profit management ensures affordabilitY for the length of the lease term.

Current staff of the Chinese Community Housing Corporation include an Executive Director, a Development Director, a Director of Management Services, a Housing Management Assistant, a Construction Manager, a Loan Program Co-ordinator, a Bookkeeper, and a Secretary for a total staff of 8 persons.

Bureau of Building Inspections

A meeting was held with Peter Burns of the Department of Apartment and Hotel Inspection. Mr. Burns was in charge of drafting and administering the San Francisco Hotel and Demolition Ordinance, which is a permanent moratorium which allows for the conversion of residential hotel units to other non-residential use only through a permit procedure which requires provision of one-for-one replacement units or contribution of 40% of replacement construction costs. The ordinance was adopted in 1981 after it was found through research that the stock of hotel units in San Francisco for low income had dropped from 32,000 in 1975 to 26,800 in 1980.

A significant amount of time was spent at Mr. Burns office reviewing the forms and procedures used by the City of San Francisco to keep track of people in rooms and monitoring the supply of low income housing stock in the City. For example, each residential hotel in the city must maintain a daily log containing the status of each room, whether it is used for residential or tourist use, and the name of each occupant. Each hotel must maintain copies of rent receipts and the daily log must be available for general perusal.

In addition, on October 15th of each year, every hotel owner and operator must file a report with the Bureau of Building Inspection summarizing the number of rooms, vacancies, average rents, the nature of services provided to permanent residents (defined as anyone staying longer than 32 days), and whether there has been an increase or decrease in the services so provided. The City will only issue licenses to those operators who comply with these requirements.

Any owner or operator of a residential hotel may apply for a permit to convert one or more residential units by submitting an application to the City and providing information on the nature of the conversion, the number of units lost, drawings and floor plans, a decription of improvements and their timing, the current rental rates for each residential unit to be converted, the length of tenancy of the permanent residents affected by the conversion, and a statement regarding how one-for-one replacement of the units to be converted will be achieved, including the location of replacement housing,

One-for-one replacement housing can be accomplished in a number of ways: 1) construction of a comparable sized unit at comparable rents to replace each of the converted units; 2) provision of a similar low cost rental units somewhere else in the marketplace; 3) construction or cause to be constructed or rehabilitated apartment units for elderly, disabled or low-income persons at a ratio of less than one-to-one to be determined by the City Planning Commission; and 4) pay tothe City and County of San Francisco an amount equal to 40% of the cost of construction of an equal number of comparable units plus site acquisition costs. All such payments shall go into a San Francisco Residential Hotel Preservation Fund Account, and the Department of Real Estate shall determine the amount based on two independent appraisals.

A permanent resident, who, as a result of the conversion must relocate off site, shall be reimbursed the actual moving expenses, not to exceed $300. However, a permanent resident displaced by a partially completed conversion shall be entitled to a displacement allowance of $1,000. Furthermore, he must be given 60 days notice.

Discussions with Mr. Burns confirmed that San Francisco now has 19,360 regulated residential hotel units in 518 buildings. Citywide, residential hotel unit rents have risen an average of 23% per year since passage of the ordinance in 1981, with average rents as of late 1984 of $252/month. The ordinance has been reasonably effective in preserving the physical supply of low and moderate income housing. However, the ordinance does not deal with two issues - rent escalation and units intentionally held vacant - which over time may affect the availability of that housing supply to low and moderate income households.

An excellent report entitled "The San Francisco Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance" prepared by the City Planning Department in November, 1985 made the observation that the replacement provisions were too onerous and have discouraged conversion applications. The report states, "Despite the replacement provision's apparent deterrent effect, one unfortunate consequence may be that some developers avoid the cost altogether through illegal conversions.

Mission Housing Development Corporation

The key staff of the Mission Housing Development Corporation were interviewed at length on the afternoon of June 12th. This organization was established in 1971 by the Mission Coalition Organization under the Model Cities Program of the federal government to deal with the housing needs of the Mission Community in San Francisco. The goals of the organization are to preserve and expand the supply of decent and affordable housing, to establish among public and private housing agencies a greater responsiveness to the housing needs of local residents, and to function as a catalyst for economic development by creating training and job opportunities.

In the organization's 15 years experience, it has constructed five new housing developments and infill projects totalling 203 units for families and seniors on fixed incomes; it has rehabilitated over 800 units; it provides property management for over 200 units through its subsidiary, Caritas Management Corporation; has provided homeownership housing for over 80 families; and has developed a Master Plan for the Inner Mission. The organization serves an area of San Francisco that is mostly Latinos and Asian, with 80% of the population as renters and 15% living in overcrowded conditions.

A typical project of MHDC was the rehabilitation of the Woodward Hotel, which was a vacant, condemned, 70 room building which was waiting for the wrecking ball. MHDC, on behalf of the owners, obtained rehabilitation loan commitments of $145,000 from the State Department of Housing and Community Development and $250,000 from the City Rehabilitation Program. In exchange for these fund commitments, the owners of the hotel agreed to make 80% of the hotel rooms available to very low-income tenants (those with incomes of 50% or less of the areas median income) and the remaining 20% to low-income (those with incomes of 80% or less of the areas median income). The owners agreed to provide up to $200,000 of their own funds to make the project feasible. Rehab costs came to $49.52 per square foot or $10,035 per unit. These costs were higher than normal because the work included all new mechanical systems, and seismic reinforcing, finishing, and sprinkling equipment throughout.

MHDC is now working on developing new sources for financing rehabilitation projects, given the shortage of federal, state, or city funds. To this end, the Corporation is getting into the syndication of two hotels, and is developing agreements between private developers, the City, and the Mission Housing Development Corporation where the developer will provide funds in exchange for housing credits which are required as mitigation for converting existing buildings into condominiums.

SEATTLE VISIT June 13, 1986

8:00 a.m. Common Ground
811 5th Avenue
Seattle, Washinton
Steve Clagett, Director
(see special commissioned paper)

10:00 a.m. Interim Housing
409 South Maynard
Seattle, Washington
Sue Taoka, Director

12:00 p.m. Seattle Emergency Housing Coalition
905 Spruce Street
Seattle, Washington
Martha Dilts, Executive Director

2:30 p.m. Department of Community Development
City of Seattle
400 Yesler Building
Ted Burton, Director

Common Ground

Common Ground was incorporated in February 1980 by the Church Council of Greater Seattle and the Metropolitan YMCA to enable Seattle area non-profit, religious, and community groups to develop, preserve, and operate low-income housing. The organization has nine employees, four of which are housing professionals. Common Ground runs a basic program, a downtown project, and the mental health housing project.

The basic program activities include long-term leasing opportunities for low-income housing and emergency shelters, federal section 202 projects, inner city rehabilitation, the Seattle Senior Housing Program, and the development of a seniors mobile home park. The Downtown Project, started in 1981, provides maintenance/minor repair, management and financing assistance to owners and operators of low income housing in Seattle's downtown core. Recently, Common Ground produced an exhaustive manual for national distribution on the management of single-room-occupancy hotels. Currently, the Downtown Project manages the financially troubled 83-unit Olive Tower in downtown Seattle. The Mental Health Housing Project, begun in 1982, creates housing for the mentally ill by bringing the resources of the religious

community, businesses, and civic groups into partnership with community mental health agencies to lease and sponsor single family houses, apartments, and rooms in downtown residential hotels.

In terms of innovations, Common Ground staff have created a computer program which will compare the preferences of each homesharing program applicant to other applicants and produce a unique printout of potential matches. The program will significantly reduce the time now required to manually conduct this search, insure that no opportunities are missed, free staff for the more human aspects of matching and increase the potential number of applicants served.

The Executive Director, Steve Clagett, described in detail how the City of Seattle has responded to the problem of singles and the homelsss. The seven major areas include the following:

> <u>Extensive and Continuing Research</u> of Seattle's single housing, the people living in it, and potential resources to preserve and improve low-income single person housing;
>
> <u>Regulation</u> such as fees and replacement requirements for the demolition of low-income housing, and requirements that units be actively rented and supported if they can be rehabilitated at modest cost;
>
> <u>Private development incentives</u> including extra height for downtown non-residential buildings when developers pay a "housing bonus", sponsor low-income housing, or purchase excess development rights above existing downtown low-income housing;
>
> <u>Local tax financing</u> through special low-income housing levies for direct "pay as you go" housing programs and general obligation bond issues;
>
> <u>Application of federal housing and community development programs</u> which Seattle worked to modify to better meet the shelter needs of its downtown single population;
>
> <u>Watchdogging government and private action</u> likely to adversely affect the low-income housing stock and requiring measures to mitigate the potential loss of low-income housing;
>
> <u>A Strong Development and Advocacy Community</u> composed of City, other public agency, non-profit, and religious organizations which forms unique partnerships to each preservation project.

According to Mr. Clagett, although comprising only 7% of Seattle's households, the Downtown houses 13.5% of Seattle's one-person households, 15.3% of its households with incomes below $5,000, and 18% of all one-person households in poverty. Also, recent years have witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of homeless youth and mentally ill people downtown. Current estimates of runaway youth in Seattle range from 250 to 750.

Like many other major cities, the downtown population of homeless, mentally ill people increased dramatically due to the failure of the mental health system and social welfare systems to accommodate former inmates released from state institutions through the miracle of psychotropic drugs. Seattle's three major downtown emergency shelters report that approximately 40% of their clients are mentally ill.

Mr. Clagett described the loss of housing in the downtown area. Between 1960 and 1980, Seattle's population declined from 31,876 to 19,300, or a loss of 40%. During this period, the downtown lost 15,622 housing units or a loss of 44.7%. In December 1985, city housing planners estimated that only 6,001 low-income units remained in Seattle's downtown.

Mr. Clagett has produced a 34 page paper for the Task Force outlining the details of what programs have worked for Seattle and how they work. The general approach is the carrot and stick. Residential buildings may not be vacated until they fall beyond repair. They may not be torn down unless replacement housing is built or a cash payment is made in place of replacement.

Downtown office developers are encouraged to build and preserve housing. Only by doing so can they increase their new building's bulk by up to 35%. A developer seeking extra floor area in the highest density downtown zone can achieve it by contributing $15.30 per extra square foot to the City's housing funds; a negotiated amount, currently averaging $10 per square foot to purchase excess development rights above low-income housing; or the developer can participate directly in the construction or rehabilitation of low income housing.

Finally, Common Ground indicated that there is a very active low-income development and advocacy community in Seattle. Office developers, Seattle is learning, are not interested in building or rehabilitating low income housing directly, but they are participating actively in projects the low-income development community initiates and carries through. Seattle non-profits and public agencies are aggressively applying the funds generated through developer contributions, sales of excess development rights, City

housing loans, and money generated to mitigate low-income housing impacts. (See Special Commissioned Paper for details.)

INTERIM HOUSING

Mr. Bairstow met with Sue Taoka, Director of Interim Housing and Don Rounds, a Housing Planner. This organization is responsible for non-profit housing proposals in the International District, which has been the focal point for the Asian population of Seattle and the Pacific Northwest since the 19th Century. During the 1880's, the Japanese migrated to Seattle from California and established a community in the District. The first Filipino immigrants came to the District after 1900 and were later joined by Koreans, Samoans, Vietnamese and Cambodians. Today, the International District is home for a diverse mix of Asians, Blacks, Whites, and Native Americans, and includes both long term residents and recent immigrants.

The current population of the I.D. is estimated to be 1,400 persons residing in 1,200 households. In addition, a summer population of transient Filipino cannery and farm workers who pass through the district seasonally raises the population to 1,600 persons. The residents of the district are primarily elderly and poor. In 1978, a survey by Inter Im and the City of 18 hotels/apartments in the District revealed that 40% were elderly with 93% of residents with incomes below $6,000 per year. 74% were on fixed incomes, 80% were single room tenants, and 11% were disabled and handicapped. Furthermore, 99% of I.D. residents have income below 80% of the county median income level, clearly qualifying the area as a low and moderate income neighbourhood.

Fire and building code violations coupled with the construction of Interstate 5 resulted in the loss of 3,000 housing units in the International District during the early 1960's. As a result, housing development policy focused on providing housing to the elderly residents of the District to offset past housing losses.

From 1969 to 1979 the District was able to construct and/or rehab 592 units of housing to serve the existing low-income residents. Despite the additional housing, the District was still faced with 945 units of delapidated single room occupancy (SRO) housing. The occupied SRO units were in marginal condition and threatened with possible future closure if action was not taken to restore them. In addition, the District had over 816 vacant SRO units that offered the potential for rehabilitation.

In 1979 the community and city joined forces in an concerted effort to revitalize the vacant and marginal SRO units in the International District. The City Council and Mayor identified the District as a Neighbourhood Strategy Area (NSA) to focus city and federal funds in a coordinated rehabilitation of the District. The goal was to develop mixed use residential and commercial properties to provide commercial rental space, 225 low-income, and 225 market rate housing units.

The NSA program produced 61 rent subsidized low-income units, 96 low-income units and 50 market rate units with 60,000 square feet of rehabilitated commercial space up to 1985. With the successful completion of the Alki in 1968, the NSA program will have achieved rehabilitation of 207 units, still 243 units short of the 450 goal.

For the 1986-91 period, the three goals of Interim Housing are a) meet the 243 unit shortfall, b) preserve existing low-income units in the occupied buildings in the I.D., and c) act as a catalyst to produce, develop, own, and/or manage housing units to the extent possible. To complete the 243 additional units (68 low income, 175 market rate housing), vacant units will be rehabilitated. Residential construction will only take place in buildings with commercial space. New commercial space will compliment the business environment. Residential construction will incluce mixed income units, with 20% for low income renters.

Furthermore, up to 12 units of a large family housing will be processed, as well as 30 units of congregate care housing for low-income frail elederly. In addition, to preserve existing low-income units, conversion of SRO to studio units and/or upgrading SRO units where feasible through moderate or phased relabilitation.

Mr. Don Rounds, a housing planner, suggested that it was useful to divide all the work remaining into 4 categories: moderate rehab for occupied and unoccupied, and substantial rehab, occupied and unoccupied.

An example of an innovative rehab project in the International District was the Atlas Hotel, which was a 59 year old commercial-residential vacant building which was ineligible for both federal rehab assistance or rent subsidies because its rooms did not meet HUD minimum property standards. The HUD Innovative Grant criteria offered an opportunity to modify those standards. In 1979, Seattle's Office of Community Development was awarded $639,000 through HUD, together with $435,000 from the Seattle Housing Authority.

28 of the 47 finished rooms became SRO's (12 x 22 feet; 264 square feet) with specially designed fold-down furniture and

a small kitchenette. They will still lack the bathroom and minimum square footage normally required by HUD. Four additional units will have a small bathroom, and 15 will be one bedroom units with kitchen and bath (550 square feet). The larger one bedroom units will rent for $175 to $250 per month, providing a slight subsidy to the SRO units (without bath) that will rent for $125 per month. Aside from this private internal subsidy, the project will receive no federal or local rent subsidies.

A contract for the $953,000 in rehabilitation work was negotiated in late 1981 and completed 10 months later. The final costs averaged less than $21,000 per unit. The $435,000 contribuition through the Seattle Housing Authority is actually tax-exempt financing from a local lender, backed by $4.5 million in Housing Authority money set up as a loan guarantee fund. In the past, this fund has been used to guarantee single family home loans to low-income families. It is now being used to finance multifamily projects, including SRO's. The $4.5 million in city funds guarantees more than $20 million in loans.

Another interesting financing arrangement in Seattle was the Lewiston Hotel loan, which has an interesting payback feature. The owner received $175,000 at no interest for 15 years to rehabilitate the 52 room hotel. In exchange for such reasonable terms, the owner has agreed to maintain rents at a level affordable to the present tenants for the life of the loan. In addition, for every year beyond the initial 15 year period that rents are kept affordable, the city will forgive 20 percent of the principal. The entire loan could be forgiven by the 20th year. Should the owner decide to sell the hotel at any time before the initial 15 years, a due-on-sale clause requires full payment of the loan. The city hopes, however, that all the hotels will remain as low cost housing for the full terms of the loans.

Seattle Emergency Housing Service

The Executive Director of the Seattle Emergency Housing Service, Martha C. Dilts, was interviewed and several projects in Seattle were visited. Also, since Ms. Dilts has been active with the National Coalition for the Homeless, the Homeless Persons' Survival Act, which was tabled in the Senate and the House in June of 1986 was discussed at great length. The following notes highlight the work of the Seattle Emergency Housing Service, the experience of the El Rey project, which is considered to be the first facility in the United States to offer an integrated program for homeless adults with chronic mental problems, and the key components of the Homeless Persons Survival Act.

Seattle Emergency Housing Service Since 1972, Seattle Emergency Housing Service (SEHS) has provided emergency housing and other resources to homeless families with children to help them get back on their feet. In December, 1985, for example, during one of the harshest months on record, Seattle area shelters were forced to turn away 4,641 homeless people, an increase of 26% over the same month in 1984. Of those turned away, 76% were women and children or young people. The main reasons cited for seeking shelter were a) out of work (32%), b) medical problems (18%), and c) family crisis or domestic violence.

From its modest beginnings in four donated apartments with volunteer staff, SEHS has grown into the largest and oldest family shelter in Washington State. In the last 12 years, emergency housing has been provided for over 2,000 homeless families at SEHS facilities. Sixty percent of the families housed are single parents and their children. The need for emergency housing for families has doubled since 1980. In 1984 SEHS housed 284 families, but turned away 4,307 families due to lack of space.

The SEHS model of emergency shelter has proved effective and cost efficient and has been replicated in six other communities in both Washington State and other states. Thirty-five furnished apartments with outdoor play areas are rented from the Seattle Housing Authority in three family neighbourhoods. In addition to emergency housing, food and other resources are provided. Modest program service fees are requested, but noone is turned away because of inability to pay. Major funding sources for the emergency housing program have included the United Way, the City of Seattle, and contributions from foundations, churches, and individuals.

SEHS offers two specific programs, the Revolving Loan Fund, and Interim Housing. The former provides no interest loans through the People's Bank to offset the high cost of moving into permanent housing. Interim Housing provides shelter, for one to three months, for families leaving the emergency housing facility. A permanent Interim Housing facility will increase significantly the number of families that can be served through the crucial transition time between emergency housing and re-entry into permanent housing.

The El Rey Apartments, Shelter and Treatment for Homeless Mentally Ill Patients In Seattle, approximately 3,000 persons seek shelter each night, of which, approximately 400 homeless persons are found sleeping on the streets after the shelters have been filled. Forty percent of these persons are mentally ill adults who are not receiving the adequate treatment or support to live independently.

In 1984, the Washington State Legislature approved funding for the development of a residential treatment facility for homeless mentally ill street people. The El Rey is a vacant four storey building in downtown Seattle which will be renovated in 1985 and 1986. The City of Seattle will own the building and Community Psychiatric Clinic, a community-based nonprofit agency, will operate the facility.

Four levels of supervised housing will be combined with the rehabilitation and prevocational programs at the El Rey. The tiered living includes crisis intervention, intensive care, congregate care and semi-independent apartments. This continuum allows a client to live in a protective, structured setting until they develop the skills to progress to the next level. If a client decompensates, intervention and treatment can be accommodated on another level within the facility. The El Rey will provide housing, treatment and work training to 60 residents. In addition, another 60 persons may participate in the El Rey treatment/prevocational programs. For more information on the El Rey project, contact Dorothy Lengyel, Seattle Department of Community Development, Housing Division, at (206) 625-4553 or Helen Schwedenberg, Executive Director, Community Psychiatric Clinic, at (206) 447-3614.

The Homeless Person's Survival Act of 1986 This bill, currently before the U.S. Congress and Senate, and introduced on June 26, 1986, was introduced by Representative Mickey Leland (Texas), Rep. Gore (Tennessee), and Metzenbaum (Ohio). The Act is a comprehensive proposal to alleviate the immediate misery of homelessness while also addressing its causes. Based on the work of over ten national organizations with expertise in related areas, the Act proposes federal action to provide (1) emergency relief, (2) preventive measures and (3) long-term solutions. In three separate titles, the bill proposes measures to conform federal efforts to the contemporary reality of the nation's homeless poor.

Under the first bill, emergency relief, states are required to provide overnight shelter for all homeless persons. Modeled on an existing federal emergency shelter program for homeless families, now in effect in about half the states, the proposal would provide the bare essentials of emergency shelter for all persons in all states. Some of the provisions include: provision of effective outreach to homeless persons eligible for Food Stamp and SSI benefits; permit use of Food Stamps by homeless persons to buy prepared meals; provision of health and mental health care to homeless persons; removal of barriers to education for homeless children; and prohibition of the imposition of permanent address requirements for receipt of benefits.

Under the second bill, Preventive Measures, the Act proposes a series of measures designed to avert the downward cycle to homelessness faced by families living on the margin of destitution. The bill proposes to prevent certain precipitating causes of homelessness, such as the demolition of needed low rent dwellings, and reduce the wait period where persons released from mental or penal institutions must wait while applications for benefits are processed. Further, the bill seeks to modify existing federal programs for needy families with children, which now discourage the maintenance of family life, and lead to the growing spectacle of homeless children.

Highlights of the preventive portions of the bill include: prevention of unnecessary evictions from subsidized housing; provision of temporary rental assistance to avert evictions and foreclosures in private housing; preservation of low-rent units such as SRO's; provision of pre-release procedures for SSI and Food Stamp benefits; and extension of SSI disability to persons suffering from severe mental illness.

Under the third bill, long-term solutions, the proposed Act seeks a responsible long-term solution to homelessness by addressing what is widely recognized as its major cause: an increasing scarcity of low-income housing. The bill proposes to increase the number of subsidized housing certificates and public housing units now available and to ensure the preservation of existing units. Furthermore, the bill seeks to produce many more residences for the chronically mentally ill which have resulted from the policies of deinstitiutionalization. Highlights of this portion of the bill include: increasing section 8 and public housing units; requiring local governments receiving federal funds to make vacant, tax-forclosed buildings available to house the homeless; and encouragement of the development of community-based residences for the homeless mentally ill. It is expected that this bill will take until the end of 1986 to go through the various committee phases. At the present time there is strong support from Democrats and only lukewarm support from Republicans. As a Result, passage of the bill is still in an uncertain stage.

Community Development - City of Seattle

The Director of the Community Development Department, Ted Burton, and Dorothy Lengyel, a Housing Development Specialist, were interviewed at length. Most of the discussions centred around the 1985 Downtown Low-Income Housing Survey, the City's Housing Preservation and Maintenance Ordinances, and some of the City's housing programs designed to preserve the low income stock in Seattle.

In terms of the survey, downtown low-income housing was last surveyed in 1983, when 7,311 low-income units were counted. The Downtown Plan established the goal of maintaining a minimum of 7,311 low-income housing units downtown through public and private action. The May 1985 study noted that there has been a continuing loss of low-income housing in the downtown area since 1983, despite strong efforts by the City to preserve the stock. The survey, using various assumption and methodologies, estimated that between 1,251 and 1,310 units have been lost, leaving a total of just over 6,000 units of low-income rental stock in the downtown.

Relatively few of the units lost were in buildings closed or demolished. Most of the units lost are now either being rented at levels affordable to households with slightly higher incomes, or are being operated as commercial hotels or shelters. A total of 412 of the units that experienced rent increases are now serving households in the federally defined "lower income" category (50 to 80 percent of area median income) as opposed to the "very low income" category (0 to 50 percent of median) which was used to define low income housing under the Downtown Plan.

The Report "1985 Downtown Low-Income Housing Survey" dated December 18, 1985 notes that the task of replacing the very low income housing that has been lost is becoming more difficult and more expensive over time. There are fewer buildings remaining that are inexpensive to stabilize and easy to preserve. Increasingly, the report calls for more expensive projects involving substantial rehabilitation of vacant buildings or new construction. The Report notes that the city's two ordinances, the Housing Preservation Ordinance and the Downtown Housing Maintenance Ordinance have been effective tools to combat building closure and demolition.

The report goes on to say that the City has been unable to prevent the gradual gentrification of apartment units in certain city neighbourhoods. While two city programs, the Transfer of Development rights Program and building acquisition by nonprofits using city funds are helping, the City will need to look at providing rent subsidies in existing buildings. The study speculates that gradual increases in low-income rents downtown does not systematically displace tenants, but it would be cheaper to subsidize tenants in situ than have to build more expensive housing. Mr. Barton indicated that Seattle might explore the idea of introducing their own shelter allowance or rent supplement program.

The Housing Preservation Ordinance, first passed by City Council in the summer of 1979, required most persons requesting a demolition permit to comply with several provisions first, including:

Tenants must be notified no less than 120 days before a permit is issued.

Tenants could only be evicted during the 120 day period for a few limited reasons.

Any tenant with an income less than 80% of the area median in the building just prior to the permit's issuance is entitled to be moved at the owner's expense into a comparable unit, or to receive $1500 if their income is below 50% of the area median or $750 if it is between 50% and 80%.

Owners must replace housing demolished. In the downtown, 100% of the net residential area must be replaced in accordance with the City's preservation goals, while in other areas of the City, from 0% to 50% of the lost residential square feet must be replaced.

Owners may provide housing in four different ways: move the housing that would have been demolished, construct new housing, rehabilitate a building vacant for over five years, or contribute to the City's Low Income Housing Replacement Fund in an amont equal to the City's estimated cost to meet the replacement requirement. Owners electing to replace housing normally must keep it rental housing for 20 years. After five years, it can be converted to condominium ownership, but the owner will be required to pay a pro-rated portion of the original replacement cost into the Low Income Housing Replacement Fund. If a redeveloper elects to build replacement housing which will remain low-income for 20 years, the required net residential area is reduced to a quarter of the original replacement requirement. Those electing to replace housing must post a bond with the City equivalent to the cost of the required replacement housing. If the replacement housing is not ready for occupancy within three years, the City may apply the amount of the bond to the Low-Income Housing Replacement Fund.

At the present time, the City is having its Ordinance challenged in the courts as providing an unfair burden on developers in terms of fees. Nevertheless, there have been at least three major projects in Seattle where developers have complied with the Ordinance. For example, a proposed large office building downtown, the Stimson Center will be built on the site of the old Windsor Hotel, 108 units. Its developers have agreed to rehabilitate more than 50 vacant units in the Alki Hotel downtown for rent to persons of low income. The developers of another large building on the site of the Doris and Breslin Apartments, 75 units, have paid $1.3 million to assist a subsidized new construction project outside of the downtown. In addition, they paid

$300,000 to a coalition of low-income housing advocates who then agreed to cease further legal challenges to the project.

The Housing Preservation Ordinance also proved ineffective against owners who did not demolish or change their building's use, but simply let it become vacant by neglect or design. To counter this housing loss, the City passed the Housing Maintenance Ordinance (HMO). The requirements of the ordinance are so strict that the City could only promulgate them within the State Constitution by declaring a housing emergency in the downtown and applying the ordinance to that area.

The HMO requires that "Owners of habitable low-income rental units or low-income rental units that can feasibly be made habitable shall make a good faith effort to rent all such units." If the City determines that an owner has failed or refused to make such a good effort as evidenced by vacancy rates above 20%, failing to offer units for rent, offering units at excessive rents, reducing services, changing rules to adversely affect tenants, intentionally vandalizing units or allowing tenants to do so, or wantonly failing to comply with applicable codes, it may find an owner in violation of the ordinance. The HMO requires owners to repair units if the repair cost over three years will not exceed $2,000 per unit without City assistance, or $4,000 per unit, if City assistance is also made available.

The HMO sets up a City fund to assist owners with compliance. For 1987, the Mayor's Office is recommending that the City supply that fund with $100,00 from the City's federal Community Development Block Grant Program. The Department of Community Development may make grants up to $2,000 per unit and no interest loans up to $4,000 per unit and may forgive any loans made at a rate of 20% of the original principal owed each year up to a maximum forgiveness of $600 for each year the unit remains available for low-income occupancy. Finally, if a building can be made habitable within the cost limitations of the HMO and the owner fails or refuses to do so, the HMO allows the City to petition the Superior Court to appoint a receiver to manage and operate the building.

The Housing Maintenance Ordinance is relatively new, having passed the City Council in August of 1985. Nonetheless it is proving to be a potent tool to stop low-income housing loss. Already the owners of one building, the Payne, have voluntarily agreed to allow a local non-profit, the Plymouth Housing Group, to lease it on a year-to-year basis for $1.00 annually to keep the building open and in compliance with the ordinance. The owners of a second building, the Terry, are also seriously considering a similar option.

VANCOUVER VISIT June 16-17, 1986

10:00 a.m. June 16	British Columbia Housing Management Commission 4330 Kingsway Burnaby, B.C. V5H 4G7 Enid Buchanan, Director, Social Housing
2:30 p.m. June 16	Downtown Eastside Resident's Association 9 East Hastings Vancouver, B.C. V6A 1M9 Jim Green, Organizer
10:00 a.m. June 17	Social Planning Department City of Vancouver 453 West 12th Avenue Vancouver, British Columbia V5Y 1V4 John Jessup, Social Planner Dr. Ann McAfee, Housing Planner

B.C. Housing Management Commission

The Director of Social Housing, Enid Buchanan (formerly Director of Research in Housing in the Ministry of Parks, Lands, and Housing) was interviewed in Burnaby, since the policy area had recently been transferred from the Department in Victoria to the Housing Commission in Burnaby. Ms. Buchanan discussed the various groups in the Vancouver area that were involved in singles housing, such as the Downtown Eastside Resident's Association, the First United Church, and the St. James Society. She mentioned that BCHMC had recently funded an 8 unit project to house psychiatrically disabled.

Considerable discussion took place regarding the new approach with the federal government and CMHC whereby the province would be the active delivery partner. Enid mentioned that the 1986 allocation for British Columbia was 1887 units, of which 335 were for rent supplements and 1552 were for new units (essentially co-ops and non-profit units). Approximately 1,000 of these units were slated for the Lower Mainland, 500 in the Victoria area, and the remaining 387 units were to be in the rest of the Province.

In a report entitled "Social Housing Report for British Columbia", the Province recommends that units be allocated as follows:

Seniors	33%
Older Singles	12%
Families with Children	30%
Disabled	15%
Special Needs	10%
TOTAL	100%

The Study also noted that the incidence of housing affordability, i.e. those households paying over 30% of their income for shelter was greatest outside of the Vancouver CMA, where 37-38% of households fell in this cateogory. For the City of Vancouver, the figure was much lower, with 21 percent with affordability problems for families with children, and 28% got for seniors and the older singles category.

Enid described a 1985 study on homesharing, completed by Frank Lewinburg, which concluded that the number of matches and hence the demand for singles housing is small. She suggested that there is a housing inventory in the province of some 22,000 units, of which about 8,000 are directly BCHMC units. Of the total, about 12,000 are non-profit projects for seniors. There are also about 500 units for the disabled.

She elaborated on the Province of B.C.'s philosophy, which is essentially against regulation of any kind, which partly explains why the Province has not wanted to become involved in regulating evictions of roomers near the Expo site. The topic of income support to singles was also discussed. Enid mentioned that the Human Resources shelter component of welfare was about $225 for a single person, and that this rate had not been adjusted since 1981. She also mentioned that the SAFER payment schedule (Shelter Allowance for Elderly Renters) which is a program that picks up 75% of the rent that exceeds 30% of income had also not been adjusted in a number of years. However, she felt that most hotels in the downtown eastside of Vancouver were charging about this amount for rent, which suggested that the issue in Vancouver was not one of affordability (as compared to a very different situation in Ontario).

Ms. Buchanan also felt that there was more supply than demand, as the vacancy rate in the downtown area was approximately 14% up to the beginning of Expo. She was not sure how this would change as a result of Expo. She pointed out that the Province funds several missions. She was aware that demolitions were a problem in Vancouver, but there had been few conversions of rooming houses to condominiums. She was not aware of any detailed research that analyzed the economics of rooming house accommodation, but had the impression that hotels were running on a breakeven basis. In conclusion, Enid admitted that the Province had not been very involved in the area of singles housing but would likely become more involved in the near future.

Downtown Eastside Resident's Association

Jim Green, Organizer for the Downtown Eastside Resident's Association (DERA) described in detail the problems of low income singles in the downtown eastside of Vancouver. There are 10,000 residents in the area, and 90% of the residents are male, mostly over the age of 55. Most of the residents live alone in a 10 x 10 room with no services, which rents for $220 per month. They have no protection under the Landlord and Tenant Act, similar to Ontario and most have a monthly income of about $400 per month. The typical resident has lived in a 42 unit hotel for five years but has lived in the downtown eastside for the past 15 years. 45% of the residents have some form of disability.

The 10,000 residents live in two major forms of housing. Most live in "residential hotels" which generally contain over 100 rooms. There usually is a sink in the room while all other facilities are "down the hall". Typically, cooking is not allowed and there is no common kitchen. There is a large pub or beer parlour on the main floor and most hotels are seven to ten floors. Rooming houses are the other main source of housing. The rooms are identical to hotel rooms but generally have hot plates for cooking and a common kitchen. Generally, the buildings are two to five stories and there are often retail outlets at grade but no pubs.

In B.C. residents of hotels and rooming houses are not classified as "tenants" but are "licensees" and thus fall outside the Residential Tenancies Act. The only legislation covering these residents is the Innkeepers Act, but this Act is silent on rent increases, rates, evictions, etc. No notice is required, no cause is required, and no reasons need to be given for evictions. There is no mediation mechanism and no appeal. When a lodging house resident contests his or her eviction the police are called in and they "stand by" while the resident and his belongings are moved onto the street. The Vancouver Police's position of non-intervention always leads to the resident being evicted.

The loss of low income stock began in Vancouver in 1980, when a new office tower replaced three residential hotels housing some 200 residents. Shortly thereafter, the Aristocrat and the Georgia were razed to make way for a parking structure topped with luxury suites, resulting in the loss of another 100 rooms. The residents of the Aristocrat were given 24 hours to vacate, while in the Georgia, residents were given one week to find housing. Also, up to 1985, lodging houses that were not prepared to upgrade to the City's fire, livability and safety standards and safety by-laws boarded up their doors, and these combined factors resulted in the loss of 1500 low-cost housing units during the period.

The next phase was the "conversion phase" which occurred as a result of Expo 86. From mid December 1985 to the end of February 1986 seven hotels alone evicted 350 long term residents. DERA tried various methods to obtain help from the Province, but to no avail. A meeting was even held with Jim Hewitt (the Minister Responsible for the R.T.A.) where he stated, "As far as I'm concerned tenants in this province have one right - they can move."

DERA also drafted a Vancouver bylaw, called the "Expo Housing Protection Bylaw" which was designed to protect long-term residents of the area during the EXPO period and limit rent increases to 5%, but although this bylaw was approved by Vancouver City Council, it was rejected by the Province. According to the latest DERA figures, which are generally accepted by the City of Vancouver, to date, 791 persons have been displaced because of EXPO.

Most evictees moved into poorer conditions where they still must live with no legislative protection. Many were evicted two or three times. Two evictees committed suicide within a few days of eviction notifications. Four others died within 2 weeks of eviction and the Vancouver Medical Health Officer ruled that in one case the death was a "direct result of being evicted".

It is possible to estimate the loss of housing stock in the Downtown Eastside over the past several years. The City of Vancouver's Social Planning Department reports that "between November 1978 and December 1982 there appears to have been a total loss of 76 lodging houses containing 1,987 units..." DERA estimates a loss of 1500 units between 1980 and 1985 and 1,000 units from 1983 to 1985. When the 791 are added due to EXPO, and taking account the overlaps in reporting period, the total units lost is in the 3,700 range.

In conclusion, it can be seen that DERA has lobbied the Provincial Government for some 13 years to include lodgers under the Residential Tenancies Act but the effort has produced no tangible results. The only hope appears to be for a change in government or a change in philosophy. The only security for residents of the downtown eastside is through social housing. Since 1983 there has been developed by private non-profit groups some 800 units in the area, largely through CMHC funding. The First United Church and DERA have successfully used this program to build housing with 87.5% of residents below the poverty line. Both groups have mixed families and elderly singles, disabled and able bodied. DERA completed a survey of 500 family applicants that found that 95% wanted to live in the downtown eastside, which challenged the popular myth that families do not want to live in the downtown. Both the government and DERA and closely watching this housing experiment to see how successful it can be to mix families and low income singles.

Vancouver Social Planning Department

Don Jessup, a social planner in the Social Planning Department was interviewed, as was Dr. Ann Mc Afee, a housing planner in the Planning Department. The purpose of the meeting was to describe the City's involvement in the issue of singles housing and the EXPO evictions issue, as well as describe the City's involvement in RRAP.

Ann described a report entitled "Core Planning in Nine North American Cities" produced by the Planning Department in 1981 which reviewed the experiences of downtown planning in Calgary, Edmonton, Denver, Houston, Minneapolis, Portland, San Francisco, and Seattle. Based on this survey, all of the cities, with the exception of Houston, have chosen to encourage housing downtown, with intensive office development and more housing instead of distributing downtown office development more evenly to regional sub-centres.

Most of the programs used for encouraging housing are incentive based, such as granting bonuses where development provides housing, or offering financial assistance to new housing or rehabilitation. Several cities have established "housing zones", usually located in mixed-use areas, where the inclusion of a certain amount of housing is mandatory. For instance, Toronto in 1976 up-zoned downtown housing development capacity and created some mixed-use zones with specific housing units and other housing related requirements. Portland introduced an AX Zone in their downtown where 60% of every development must be housing.

In March 1985, the Social Planning Department conducted a survey of downtown residents, entitled "Downtown Expo Housing Survey" by Donna McIrick. The study noted that there is enough accommodation for the typical Downtown resident but very soon much of it will be unaffordable. The December 1984 vacancy rate of 13% means that there were about 1,320 lodginghouse units available for occupancy. About 712 were in average or better condition. In the past six years, the Downtown has been losing, on average, 160 sleeping/housekeeping rooms a year.

Almost half of all reported rents are above the GAIN maximum for single persons. There are about 5,500 single person households depending on GAIN or HPIA income maintenance programs in the Downtown. While incomes for tenants under 65 have scarcely risen in the last two years, rents have gone up 17%. The study concluded that if the present 7% rate of "upscale" or tourist oriented renovation doubles to 15% over the next year, this will mean about 34 buildings or approximately 1,000 tenants will be directly jeapardized. In the long run, the low income tenant is more likely to lose his housekeeping room as lodging houses convert to apartments.

The latter portion of the interview concentrated on Vancouver's experience with the preservation of low cost housing through its own programs. In 1981 the City set up a Downtown Housing Implementation Committee chaired by the Social Planning Department and consisting of 5-6 other city departments. Under the Rental RRAP Enforcement Program, administered by the Planning Department (up to $2500/unit interest free loans), the City was able to RRAP about 200 units per year. The average building had about 30 units, so the City has been able to RRAP close to 7 buildings per year. In the program, the landlord has to match the funds provided by CMHC/City. The City originally had a long term plan to RRAP 3500 rooms in 1979 over a five year period. They have actually completed about 750 rooms to date under the program. The longer term goal was to provide a mix of incomes in the Downtown area, as well as increase the number of families living in the Downtown.

A second program run by the city was called the Self-contained Undersized Studio Unit Program, which encouraged non-profits to produce smaller self-contained units in the 280-300 square foot range. So far, three projects have been produced: in 1982 the Maria Gomez Building at Princess and Alexander has 75 units and this project was developed by the B.C. Housing Foundation, with rents in the $210 range (cost was $35,000 per unit); an 87 unit project at Helmekon and Richards by the 127 Society, which is just now renting up with rents at $200/month; and one other project. These projects have been quite successful, although the Planning Department does have some concerns supporting units that they feel are too small and might create density problems.

Finally, it should be mentioned that in 1984, the City of Vancouver Council instructed the Social Planning Department to prepare a 5 year Social Housing Program for the Downtown which would: 1) Address issues such as target populations, compatible tenant mixes, project locations, size and type, etc; 2) Identify potential land assemblies and existing building suitable for social housing development; 3) Compile a priority list of private non-profit societies with a commitment to and experience in managing social housing projects; 4) Develop a practical mechanism for regularly reviewing Downtown social housing needs and priorities in consultation with social housing resource groups, and CMHC, and 5) Establish a community forum for negotiating more specific needs and subsidy units for Downtown social housing projects from CMHC.